

Fort Hays State University FHSU Scholars Repository

Faculty Senate

Archives Online

9-18-1972

Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 18, 1972

FHSU Faculty Senate

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all

Recommended Citation

FHSU Faculty Senate, "Fort Hays State University Faculty Senate Minutes, September 18, 1972" (1972). *Faculty Senate*. 612.
https://scholars.fhsu.edu/sen_all/612

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Archives Online at FHSU Scholars Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of FHSU Scholars Repository.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Patrick Drinan, Secy
Faculty Senate
RE: FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes Page 1
DATE: 18 September 1972

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of 18 September 1972 at 3:30 p.m. in the Black and Gold Room of the Union.

- I. Roll Call. Members absent: Mrs. Ilene Allen, Mr. Marc Campbell, Mr. Jack Heather, Mrs. Alice McFarland, Dr. Joel Moss, Dr. Verna Parish, Mr. Cade Suran, Mr. Gary Tobias.

II. Chairman Miller's remarks:

- A. Summarized the 8 September discussions of the Executive Committee of the Senate with President Gustad and Dr. Tomanek.

1. President Gustad had indicated that the ROTC proposal was only a necessary inquiry at this time and was not being actively promoted by the administration.
2. Consultation between administration and Senate should take place before final passage or action on a matter by either administration or Senate.

B. Summary of Administrative Council proceedings:

1. Possibility of morning commencement.
2. Student recruitment will emphasize urban areas and minority groups.
3. Operating budget may be cut up to \$120,000 this year.
4. No formal intersession courses.

III. It was moved and seconded to approve the minutes as distributed. Motion carried.

IV. Dr. Harbin explains Army ROTC inquiry:

- A. Elaboration of advantages of ROTC and some of the procedural difficulties in gaining approval.

B. Questions from the floor:

1. Dr. Oliva asked if there had been previous ROTC applications. Dr. Harbin replied that only consideration to making a proposal had been discussed in the past.
2. Dr. Oliva asked why Army instead of Air Force ROTC was being proposed. Dr. Harbin indicated that the Air Force had not pursued our original discussions.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Patrick Drinan, Secy
Faculty Senate
RE: FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes Page 2
DATE: 18 September 1972

3. Mr. Crissman inquired about the "5500" figure for scholarships. Dr. Harbin explained that 5500 was the number of national ROTC scholarships.
4. Miss Veed asked Dr. Harbin if only men were eligible for ROTC scholarships. He answered that women were eligible.
5. Dr. Forsythe alluded to the number of colleges under AAUP censure that had recently got ROTC programs. Dr. Harbin discussed the necessity for military leadership through ROTC in a volunteer army.
6. Dr. Robinson asked if ROTC instructors are counted as faculty. Dr. Harbin indicated that they probably would not have faculty status in the fullest sense of the term.
7. Dr. Forsythe challenged Dr. Harbin's assessment of the status of ROTC faculty members.
8. Dr. Miller inquired about total number of credit hours given to ROTC students. Dr. Harbin explained the four-year ROTC schedule.
9. Dr. Miller asked if ROTC courses counted as part of 124 hours required for graduation. Dr. Harbin said that this had not been determined.
10. Mr. Crissman asked if space were available for ROTC courses. Dr. Harbin answered that space was sufficient for this stage of ROTC.
11. Dr. Adams inquired whether it would be possible for faculty and students to stop ROTC once the regents had approved and the administration had negotiated a ROTC contract? Dr. Harbin replied that it would be possible but that the students want it.
12. Dr. Forsythe discussed ROTC demand for prime time classroom space. Dean Garwood replied that any regularly scheduled times should permit ROTC classes to meet to the convenience of the ROTC program.
13. Dr. McCullick asked where the Army ROTC application had been sent. Dr. Harbin said that it had gone only to Faculty Senate.
14. Dr. Drinan inquired whether or not an impact study of hidden and direct institutional costs might not be useful. Dr. Harbin replied that it probably would but that there are no hidden costs.
15. Dr. Frerer asked if U.S. Army supplies all costs, such as maintenance and space. Dr. Harbin indicated that space would be our greatest contribution.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Patrick Drinan, Secy
Faculty Senate
RE: FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes Page 3
DATE: 18 September 1972

16. Dr. Staven asked for an estimate of additional students brought in by ROTC. Dr. Harbin said that he expected eventually 200 additional students.
17. Dr. James inquired whether we could get hard data on the number of students who might go elsewhere in the absence of ROTC at Fort Hays. Dr. Harbin thought that it would be possible.
18. Mr. Fall asked about surveys of student reaction. Previous studies at FHS on student attitudes were alluded to, but no one had immediate access to the specific results.
19. Dr. Oliva asked Dr. Harbin what the concept of military obligation meant in a volunteer army. Dr. Harbin replied that he was not certain but that deferments for ROTC participation would still be granted in the near future under the present system. He also indicated that there would be few financial benefits for freshman and sophomore participants in Army ROTC.
20. Dr. Adams asked if the institutional costs of ROTC could be estimated. Dr. Harbin asserted that institutional costs would be only incidental.
21. Dr. Slechta requested that Dr. Harbin identify some disadvantages of ROTC at Fort Hays. Dr. Harbin said that the only disadvantage might be to expose some anti-military sentiment.
22. Mr. Crissman asserted that credit ROTC courses would tend to reduce student numbers in non-ROTC departments. Dr. Harbin said that was not a part of the ROTC proposal.
23. Dr. Miller said that it appears necessary to ascertain whether ROTC courses will count toward the 124 credit hours for graduation.
24. Dr. Oliva inquired what kind of recommendation from the Senate does the administration want on ROTC at this time.
25. Dr. Harbin suggested a straw vote approving or disapproving the ROTC inquiry.
26. Dr. Drinan moved that an impact study be done to measure hidden and institutional costs of ROTC, and to measure student willingness to take Army ROTC. Seconded. Dr. Staven moved to amend the motion to have impact study completed in 30 days. Seconded. Amendment passed. Discussion of who would conduct the study. Dr. Drinan moved to amend the motion to allow the Chairman of the Faculty Senate to appoint a committee to conduct the study. Seconded. Amendment passed. Motion as amended carried.

FORT HAYS KANSAS STATE COLLEGE

TO: The Faculty
FROM: Patrick Drinan, Secy
Faculty Senate
RE: FACULTY SENATE MEETING
Minutes Page 4
DATE: 18 September 1972

V. Questions to Dr. Tomanek:

- A. Dr. Oliva asked Dr. Tomanek what mechanism will allow communication to the President on pending Senate matters. Dr. Tomanek said that there was some need for administration to anticipate major issues and permit administration input.
- B. Dr. Staven asked about the target date for releasing faculty. Dr. Tomanek indicated that 1 October 1972 was the target date.
- C. Dr. Staven inquired about the guidelines for releasing faculty. Dr. Tomanek replied that size of department and credit hour production were examples of some criteria.
- D. Dr. Staven asked if the administration was considering reducing department chairmen. Dr. Tomanek said that that was a good question.
- E. Dr. Oliva asked if administrative non-teaching faculty were counted in faculty load reports. Dr. Tomanek said no.
- F. Dr. Adams asked if the library would be spared in possible budget cuts. Dr. Tomanek indicated that most of the budget cuts would be from departmental operating budgets.
- G. Dr. Oliva moved that the Senate request that the library budget not be cut. Seconded. Motion carried.

VI. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.